

REMARKS

The Application has been reviewed in light of the Final Office Action mailed August 27, 2003, the Advisory Action mailed November 13, 2003, and the Office Communication mailed April 21, 2004. At the time of the Final Office Action and Advisory Action, Claims 1-24 were previously cancelled by Applicants and Claims 25-43 were pending in this Application. The Examiner has rejected Claims 25-43 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Applicants cancel Claims 25-43 and present new Claims 44- 63 in response to the Advisory Action. The Examiner has requested further explanation as to why these new claims are patentable over the prior rejections. Applicants herein provide further explanation. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103


Claims 25-43 were rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,154,738 issued to Charles Gainor Call (hereafter "Call") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0029181 filed by Michael R. Miller et al. (hereafter "Miller"). Applicants have cancelled Claims 25-43, rendering this objection moot. However, Applicants provide the following remarks.

Applicants assert that all remarks relating to Claims 25-43 presented in Applicants' response filed October 27, 2003 are applicable to the present claims, if such claims are rejected based on the same references for similar steps or features.

Although Applicants recognize that the Examiner indicated in his Advisory Action that such arguments were not persuasive, Applicants nevertheless assert that these arguments establish the patentability of the new claims, to the extent the Examiner wishes to make similar rejections.

Applicants point out that a large portion of the response filed on October 27, 2003 indicated that Applicants are not able to fully understand the nature of the Examiner's rejections. No further information was provided in the Advisory Action, which was only two lines in length. Although Applicants believe the newly presented claims are patentable, should the Examiner wish to reject these claims for any reason, Applicants request that the Examiner please at least provide a specific explanation for the rejection of each claim, particularly if such rejection is for reasons similar to those in previous Office Actions.

Applicants believe that at least one element of each of Claims 44-68 are not disclosed in the references cited with respect to previously pending Claims 25-43.



CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants request that Claims 44-63 be allowed. Early and favorable acceptance of this application is respectfully requested.

On January 27, 2004 Applicants previously submitted the appropriate fee in the amount of \$770 under 37 C.F.R. §1.17(e) for the Request for Continued Examination, and also submitted a fee in the amount of \$420 under 37 C.F.R. §1.17(a)(2) for a two-month extension of time.

Applicants believe no additional fees are due. Should any additional fees be due or any overpayment made, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-0383 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.



Michelle M. LeCointe
Reg. No. 46,861

Attorney for Applicants

Date: 5/18/07

Baker Botts L.L.P.
One Shell Plaza
910 Louisiana
Houston, Texas 77002-4992
512-322-2580
512-322-2501 (fax)